

Operations and Performance Committee

July 17, 2003

Attendees: Keith Gilles, Lorna Oberto, Bob Gilbert, Sarah Brenna, John Nixon, Mike Richardson, Allan Ayoub, Patrice Spiegel, Jolyn LeFevre, Bob Heywood, Stan Lockhart, Pamela Clark, Frank Maughan, Linetta Moyes, Karen Silver

Allan Ayoub welcomed the group and asked for introductions. He then asked for approval of the previous meeting minutes. Keith Gillians asked for clarifications on the minutes, he asked what TAA stands for. Mike Richardson explained that it stands for Trade Adjustment Assistance. Keith also said that more countries are included in this act than Mexico and Canada. Allan Ayoub explained that the NAFTA/TAA has been changed and includes other countries besides Mexico and Canada. Keith Gillians motioned to approve the minutes, Frank Maughan seconded the motion and the group approved the minutes.

Priority Score Based on Budget

Jolyn LeFevre discussed WIA services and how the services are prioritized (Most in Need). She said that this process was implemented July 2002. The current priority value is at 5. She stated that 5 are too low with current obligations being so high. It is important to change the value at this time before regions are spent with their new year funds. It was discussed to change the value to an 8 or a 10. The discussion was that a value of 10 would basically shut the funds off so a value of 8 was recommended and approved. Hoping this will help keep the priority level even instead of "turning the funds on and off". Allan Ayoub asked if the higher numbers are more restrictive. Jolyn said that they are more restrictive but by moving the priority value to 8 the Department can serve more customers in need of our services. Allan Ayoub also asked if this affects all WIA funding streams. Jolyn said that this particular priority process is set-up to serve dislocated worker and adult eligible customers. The committee members asked Jolyn if she could send them a copy of the priority form so they could see what the priority criteria is for the Adult and the Dislocated Worker programs. Bob Gilbert asked if it would be possible to use a range, i.e. 8-10. Allan Ayoub said we would also need to look at statewide implementation or region-by-region implementation. Some concerns were discussed about customers accessing services in regions with lower priority scores. We have this happen with Nephi customers going to Payson to access funds. It was

decided to implement the priority system state wide rather than region by region.

Web-based Training Vendor

On-line training providers do not meet the approval criteria for DWS. It was recommended to the committee that policy be changed to include On-line training providers. Mike Richardson said that he spoke with Pat Partridge from the Western Governors University about this issue. Mr. Partridge said that it is very important to look at testing. He also said that there is quite a bit of self-discipline that needs to go with this and participants that make it through the program make good employees because of this. He said that they would be willing to proctor exams and that 4 million students are doing this online. Allan Ayoub and Sarah Brenna gave examples of online learning. Allan also mentioned that Western Governor's University meets the criteria for a distance-learning provider. Jolyn LeFevre said the reason that this came up is because many of the online providers don't meet distance-learning criteria. Mike Richardson mentioned that the Governor is behind this and some of the smart sites could possibly be utilized if in fact on-line providers could be approved. Allan Ayoub asked what a smart site was and how it worked. Keith gave an explanation and mentioned that there have been many success stories based on this. Allan said that he has concern about home-based business and their legitimacy. Jolyn LeFevre agreed but explained that many of these providers have gone through the rigorous process that the Department of Commerce has them go through which the Dept of Commerce requirements are stricter than DWS. But there are a few questions DWS will need in addition, (1) has the provider been in business for at least one year and (2) what is the provider's performance information. Jolyn asked that if the Department of Commerce or the Utah State Office of Rehabilitation (USOR) has approved an online training provider; that DWS accept those approved applications plus any other information required by DWS. The regional provider coordinator would take the information to their Regional Council, the Regional Council could ask for additional information, could approve, or could deny based on the State Council approved Training Approval criteria. The Regional Council would then send recommendation to the State Council for final approval. Frank Maughan motioned to approve this item; Keith Gillians seconded the motion and the group approved.

Jolyn suggested that we look at doing this process for all her training providers. Frank Maughan asked how many providers go through the Department of Commerce. Jolyn said that many of the training providers do go through the Department of Commerce and in fact several of our providers have been referred by Commerce to DWS. Jolyn also said that

the provider would still go through the council process with the appropriate regional council. Allan Ayoub asked about the access to the information. Mike Richardson said that we are working with USOR but not with Commerce on this. It was mentioned that once the Regional Council has approved the provider, the approval is tentative until approved by the State Council. Frank Maughan motioned, Stan Lockhart seconded the motion and the group approved it.

Stan Lockhart asked if the Department is getting good performance data from the training providers. Mike Richardson said that currently we have a waiver that says we don't need the performance data, but we are working on getting that data. He explained that there are some privacy issues and some schools that do not want to provide any data. Allan Ayoub gave an example of the Western Governor's University. Mike said that we could use the wage match data, but at this time we can't tie this data to the training provider/school. Frank Maughan asked if this was a federal mandate. Mike mentioned that it is and there are other states that have worked through it. Bob Gilbert said that there are about 35-40 states that have this waiver. Stan Lockhart mentioned that we should stress the importance of this process to our regional councils and explain the process to them. Mike Richardson said that most front line staff know the vendors and will usually pass information on. Stan asked if there is an easy way to remove a vendor from the list. Jolyn LeFevre said that it would be very difficult to verify the information, so it is difficult to remove them.

Training Budgets from Program Budgets 2003 & 2004

Linetta Moyes explained that in 2002 the Department didn't have a training obligation. She also mentioned that we are still in close out and don't have the complete data and will provide this at the next meeting. Linetta said that TAA nationally is out of money and the Department is pursuing a National Emergency Grant (NEG) grant to cover this. She also said that the Department is over obligated in several of the regions, but that doesn't mean that we are over spent. She explained that the money covers two years and that two regions could have the obligation hit this year. Linetta said that her recommendation is to move the priority to 8 and this should help with the over obligation. She also mentioned that in order to move dislocated worker money to FEP it would need to be approved by the state council. Linetta then explained why some of the regions are obligated in the manner that they are. Allan Ayoub asked if this is a statewide priority or if it should be done on a region-by-region basis. Linetta Moyes said that the easiest way to do this statewide. She also explained the list that is used to determine the funding stream and that is done by region. Mike Richardson explained how the list works in the regions and this has a bigger influence than the priority score, but all of this is determined on the customer's eligibility.

Linetta said that she reminds the region every month where they are and to look at this. Karen Silver asked if all customers are assigned barrier levels. Mike Richardson explained that they are. He also stated that when we are low on funding the State Council needs to determine the change in the priority and at this point a priority range is not viable. Frank Maughan motioned to approve the priority number change from 5 to 8, Stan Lockhart seconded the motion and the group approved it.

Performance Measures

Mike Richardson discussed the performance measures and explained the measures and the outcomes. He mentioned that the Department has negotiated numbers with the Federal Partners, and explained how the numbers are negotiated. Mike said that the Regional Feds would not let us renegotiate the number lower based on recommendations from the Washington Feds and at this time the numbers are being renegotiated. He also mentioned that we are sorting the data by employment center and will be working with the individual centers on this issue by using best practices. Mike said that he would check the number on Eastern regions Older Youth earnings change. Frank Maughan asked about the age difference with older and younger youth. Mike Richardson explained that it depends on the age that the youth was when they entered the program, whether they are considered older or younger youth. Stan Lockhart said negative job growth creates a large pool of workers for fewer jobs; the numbers should be going down. He also said that we shouldn't call these numbers negotiated when initially they are mandated after the numbers have been negotiated then we should call them negotiated numbers.

The meeting was then adjourned.